

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 3-10 are in the application.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Honebrink in view of Falvai in view of Mottola. Claims 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Honebrink in view of Falvai in view of Mottola in view of Melsky.

Independent claim 1, the only independent claim in the application has been amended to distinguish from the cited art.

Honebrink, Falvai, Mottola, and Melsky, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a canula having a longitudinal opening completely through its wall wherein the shaft is more flexible than the hub and wherein the hub has a longitudinal opening wider than the longitudinal opening in the shaft, the longitudinal openings in the hub and shaft being mutually aligned.

Moreover, the use of different synthetic resins for the canula permits the shaft to be made more flexible than the hub. This has nothing to do with biocompatibility, durability, low cost and ease of manufacture as suggested by the Examiner. The combination with a wide hub opening and aligned narrow shaft opening cooperate to achieve the main objects of the invention. That is, to facilitate placement and removal of the canula and to avoid the risk of displacing the catheter during removal of the canula.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

An unpaid fee required to keep this case alive may be charged to deposit account 06-0735.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Howard F. Mandelbaum/  
Howard F. Mandelbaum  
Registration No. 27,519  
Attorney for Applicant

HFM:tct